

Case Number:	CM15-0085621		
Date Assigned:	05/08/2015	Date of Injury:	12/09/1997
Decision Date:	06/09/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/14/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/05/2015

HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to an expert reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. He/she has been in active clinical practice for more than five years and is currently working at least 24 hours a week in active practice. The expert reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and disputed items/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:
 State(s) of Licensure: North Carolina
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

The injured worker is female a sustained an industrial injury on December 9, 1997. She reported an injury to her left knee, right ankle, right knee and back. Previous treatment includes MRI of the left shoulder, MRI of the left knee, MRI of the right shoulder, right shoulder diagnostic arthroscopy, physical therapy, medications and modified work duties. Currently the injured worker complains of continuation of significant pain. On examination, she has continued swelling in her feet and demonstrates pain in the lateral aspect of her feet. She reports continued difficulty with weight bearing. Diagnoses associated with the request include plantar fasciitis of the bilateral feet, sprain/strain of the bilateral feet and painful gait. The treatment plan includes surgical intervention. A request was received for Flurbiprofen/cyclobenzaprine/lidocaine.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

The Final Determination was based on decisions for the disputed items/services set forth below:

Retro: Flurbiprofen/Cyclobenzaprine/Lidocaine, date of service 2/17/15: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines topical analgesics.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines topical analgesics Page(s): 111-113.

Decision rationale: The California chronic pain medical treatment guidelines section on topical analgesics states: Recommended as an option as indicated below. Largely experimental in use with few randomized controlled trials to determine efficacy or safety. Primarily recommended for neuropathic pain when trials of antidepressants and anticonvulsants have failed. (Namaka, 2004) These agents are applied locally to painful areas with advantages that include lack of systemic side effects, absence of drug interactions, and no need to titrate. (Colombo, 2006) Many agents are compounded as monotherapy or in combination for pain control (including NSAIDs, opioids, capsaicin, local anesthetics, antidepressants, glutamate receptor antagonists, adrenergic receptor agonist, adenosine, cannabinoids, cholinergic receptor agonists, agonists, prostanoids, bradykinin, adenosine triphosphate, biogenicamines, and nerve growth factor). (Argoff, 2006) There is little to no research to support the use of many of these agents. Any compounded product that contains at least one drug (or drug class) that is not recommended is not recommended. The requested medication contains ingredients, which are not indicated per the California MTUS for topical analgesic use. Therefore, the request is not certified.